



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## VIII.—ON THE PRONUNCIATION OF THE FRENCH NASAL VOWELS *IN*, *AIN*, *EIN* IN THE XVI AND XVII CENTURIES.

In a recent<sup>1</sup> doctor's dissertation of the University of Lausanne, P. Marchot examines the question of the pronunciation of the French nasal vowels *ain*, *ein*, and *in* during the XVI and XVII centuries, and comes to some rather startling conclusions, principally with regard to the development of *ain* (and *ein*). He denies the possibility of the direct development of *āin* > *ēn*. 'Passe-t-on directement de *āin* à *ēn*? Absolument pas : phonétiquement l'évolution est impossible. C'est au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle que *āin*, dénasalisé en *ayn*, passe à *eyn* et ensuite à *en*, *ēn*,' (p. 49). It is this thesis which he attempts to prove on pp. 47–62 of his monograph. The whole argumentation is based on the material presented by Thurot, *De la prononciation française*, of whom he says (p. 47), 'malheureusement, Thurot n'était pas un romaniste, et il est incontestable que plus d'une fois, il n'a pas su tirer des matériaux qu'il avait réunis tout le parti qu'il était possible d'en tirer.' I think it is safe to say, that Marchot has not succeeded much better. To be sure, the history of these nasals is not an easy problem, the grammarians of the XVI and XVII centuries are in the highest degree obscure in their statements, and it is not an easy matter to arrive at a clear understanding of their meaning. The weak point in Marchot's method is, that he interprets the statements of these grammarians literally and that he seems to lose sight of the continuity of phonetic tendency, whereas the only safe method can be, to collate and compare all the statements to the point, to eliminate every thing that appears individual with each grammarian, and to interpret what remains, along lines that are demanded by our knowledge of the history of French

<sup>1</sup> *Solution de quelques difficultés de la phonétique française*, par Paul Marchot, Lausanne, 1893.

nasalization in general, making due allowance, at the same time, for the ignorance of phonetic problems at that period, and the crude terminology then in vogue.

All during the O. Fr. period, *ain* and *ein* are nasal vowels, or rather nasal diphthongs, and before the XVI century is over we have the testimony of Rambaud that a sound approaching the modern (he writes *e fermé*, marked by the sign of nasality) has been reached. In view of this fact, it appears exceedingly doubtful that such a denasalization, as Marchot demands, took place during the XVI century. Indeed, a language does not give up a tendency so strongly established in it, as nasalization is in French, except when one has a theory to defend, as Marchot has. Before such a development can be accepted, stronger proofs than those brought forward by him will have to be advanced; in the meantime, however, another ventilation of the question cannot be amiss, even if it should lead to no more positive results than those of Marchot.

Whether *in* had any nasal quality during the O. Fr. period, is, as is well known, one of those knotty questions to which it is difficult to find a satisfactory answer. Usually writers on O. Fr. grammar merely state the uncertainty of the problem (so Schwan, § 299), but Suchier, *Altfranzösische Grammatik*, Theil 1, p. 63, boldly takes the stand that all vowels in O. Fr., *i* and *u* included, had been nasalized at the same period (about the IX century), and he refers to evidence brought forward in favor of this view by Engelmann, *Ueber die Entstehung der Nasalvokale im Altfranzösischen*, Halle, 1882. This much, however, all concede, that if *in* in O. Fr. was not a nasal vowel, much similar in sound to the modern Portuguese *ĩ*, *n* certainly, under certain conditions and in certain localities, in this combination could become palatalized, and *in* was pronounced *ing* (cf. Bartsch-Horning, § 56). To be sure, Palsgrave does not mention *i* among the vowels that are pronounced 'in the brest and sounded by the nose,' but Palsgrave was an Englishman describing a foreign language, and certainly only one year later we have the testimony of

Sylvius (*un son foible*), and in 1533 that of Bovelles (*l'a, l'i, l'o devant m ou n dans la même syllabe perdent une partie de leur son*), that *i* + *n* sounded differently from *i* + oral consonant. This speaks at least for a pronunciation *in*, and this much Marchot concedes.

The quality of the *i* in this combination is a much more difficult question to determine. Thurot cites no description of the sound from grammarians earlier than Cauchie (1570), who was a Picard, and who describes the sound of *im* or *in* as not differing from that of *eim* or *ein*. Beza, *De Francicae linguae recta pronuntiatione*, 1584, says nothing directly about the pronunciation of *in*, but he makes use of this combination to figure the pronunciation of *ain* and *ein* (ed. Tobler, p. 66); and from this statement Meyer-Lübke, *Rom. Gram.*, I, § 33, concludes that all three combinations were pronounced  $\bar{e}$  as early as Beza's time. The general inherent difficulties of the problem are heightened by the insufficiency of the terminology; *in* passes through  $\bar{i} > \bar{e}$  and *ein* becomes  $\bar{e}$ , and the grammarians of the time, with the best of intentions, but not having any phonetic transcriptions, could do but one of two things. Either they say *in* is pronounced *in* or they describe the sound, as Cauchie and Beza do, as being equal to that of *ein* and *aim*.

It becomes evident that the solution of this question is closely allied to that of the pronunciation of *ain* and *ein*, and that the history of these three combinations must be studied together. Now *in*, in order to become  $\bar{e}$  had to pass through the intermediate stages  $\bar{i} > \bar{e} > \bar{e} > \bar{e}$ , a line in which the two ends could easily enough be distinguished, even by untried phoneticians, but where the intermediate steps are so closely related and so similar, that even a skilled ear finds difficulty in detecting the difference. The question, therefore, becomes a pertinent one, to ask if among the different descriptions that we find for the sound of *in*, some are not intended really to define the intermediate steps between  $\bar{i}$  and  $\bar{e}$ .

For the principal point in his theory, that  $\tilde{ain}$  was denasalized to *ayn*, Marchot attempts no proof whatever, but for the

fact that this *ayn* had become *eyn*, or even *eyn*, he bases himself upon the statements of Beza (1554), Meigret (1542), Ramus (1562), La Taille (1573), Baïf (1574), Delamothe (1592), Lubin (1609). To gain a basis for our inquiry, let us see what can be gathered from the descriptions of Beza, who is accessible in somewhat more complete form than the other grammarians of the period.

In his *De Franciscæ linguae recta pronuntiatione* (ed. Tobler, 1868), on p. 35 we find the following description of nasality: 'Sed hoc in primis curandum est peregrinis omnibus, quod antea in litera *m* monui, nempe hanc literam, quoties syllabam finit, quasi dimidiato sono pronuntiandam esse, mucrone videlicet linguae minime illiso superiorum dentium radici, alioqui futura molestissima pronuntiatione; quo vitio inter Francos laborant etiamnum hodie Normanni. Graecos autem haud aliter hanc literam ante  $\kappa \gamma \chi$  pronuntiare consuevisse annotat ex Nigidio Figulo A. Gellius.' Very similar is the statement on p. 33: '*m* . . . syllabam finiens, sive intra ipsam dictionem, sive in ultima vocabulorum, perinde prorsus pronuntiatur ut *n* . . . ita videlicet, ut non modo labia non occludantur, sed etiam linguae mucro dentium radicem non feriat, ut *temporel* (temporalis), *hymne* (hymnus), *dommage* (damnus), *dam* (damnum), *nom* (nomen), *haim* (hamus), *faim* (fames), *temps* (tempus), perinde efferenda, acsi scriptum esset, *tanporel*, *hinne*, *donmage*, *dan*, *non*, *hin*, *fin*, *tans*.' Marchot's denasalization evidently would have had to have taken place before this date, for whatever quality we may decide to ascribe to *him* = *haim*, and *fin* = *faim*, the identity of the nasality in these words and in *temps* and *nom* is distinctly affirmed here.

If we next turn to Beza's descriptions of *ain*, *ein*, and *in*, we shall find a great deal of obscurity prevailing. On p. 47, *bain*, *gain*, and *plain* are said to be pronounced 'ut si scriptum esset *bein*, *guein*, *plein*,' and on p. 66, where the silent vowels are commented upon, we read, 'quiescit (a) coeunte vocali *i* et *n*, ad constituendam syllabam eandem, ut *pain* (panis), *ainsi* (ita), *sainct* (sanctus), in quibus *a* non auditur . . . . Sic dicimus in

adiectivo masculino *vain*, quasi scriptum sit *vin*, a vocali vel prorsus quiescente vel exiliter admodum sonante . . . .’ The combination *ein* is described on p. 50 as follows: ‘Haec diphthongus non profertur nisi mox sequente *n*, et ita pronuntiatur, ut paululum prorsus ab *i* simplici differat, ut *gueine* (vagina), *plein* (plenus), cuius tamen foemininum *plene* usus obtinuit, ut absque *i* scribatur et efferatur, Picardis exceptis, qui, ut sunt vetustatis tenaces, scribunt et integro sono pronuntiant *pleine*.’ Then follow some further remarks on the words of this class, and it is stated that in many of them, where the Latin has an *i*, ‘haec diphthongus scribatur expresso etiam *e* sed usque adeo obscure et correpte, ut vix ejus sonus sentiat, ut *sein* (sinus), *ceindre* (cingere), *feindre* (ingere), *peindre* (pingere), *teindre* (tingere), *veindre* (vincere), cum derivatis.’ On p. 66 we read, with reference to this same diphthong, ‘*e* quiescit similiter in diphthongo *ei*, sequente *n* in eadem syllaba, ut *plein* (plenus), quasi scriptum sit *plin* . . . . Superflua est haec litera et merito, si ratio usui dominaretur, expungenda in quibusdam vocabulis, ut *sein* (sinus), *peindre* (pingere), *ceindre* (cingere), *veindre* (vincere), *feindre* (ingere), docente etymo, temere et per abusum literam *e* in haec vocabula irrepsisse.’ The evident purpose here, to model the French pronunciation on the Latin etymon of the word, as far as it was known, brings in a new element, entirely overlooked by Marchot, and which forces us to set to work very cautiously, when we endeavor to interpret these early descriptions of sounds. The nasal *in* is not described by itself, but when speaking of *oin* (p. 53), Beza says, ‘haec diphthongus nativo suo sono, id est utraque correpte prolata vocali profertur, quoties eum illa cohaeret *n*, ut *moins* (minus), *moindre* (minor), *soin* (sollicitudo), *loin* (longe), *besoin* (necessitas), *tesmoin* (testis), quibus dictionibus extremis imperite nonnulli *g* adiciunt.’ There is still one more important passage which may serve to throw light on our question. The combination *ien* is described (p. 55) as follows: ‘Ibidem ante *n*, vel cum ipsa diphthongo coalescens, ut *bien*, *chien*, in quibus tamen vocibus diximus *e* ut *i* proferri, acsi scriptum sit *biin*, *chiin*, . . . .’

From all these statements, the following points are evident : *ain*, *ein*, *in* are all pronounced with nasal quality ; *ain* and *ein* are pronounced alike, and are still diphthongs, but the first element has a weak and indistinct sound, which proves that the diphthong was rising ; to the ear of Beza, both sounded much like the sound given to the nasal *in* ; this same sound *in* is also given as the pronunciation of the nasal in *ien*. Marchot takes Beza literally and concludes that the pronunciation was *in* ; but this certainly does not suit the pronunciation of *ien*, which can only have been *iẽ*. It seems to me there is but one interpretation which will suit all the facts in the case, and that is the following. Evidently the older nasal *ĩ* (*ing* is only an awkward representation of this sound) had started on its way to become *ẽ* and had arrived at the first stage, when it was neither *ĩ* nor yet *ẽ*, but a very close *ẽ* nasalized, which may easily appear to the ear to be still *ĩ*. On the other hand the older *ẽin*, where the nasal quality existed only in the first element, had become nasalized throughout, and had shifted the accent on the second element (*ẽin* > *ẽĩ* > *ẽẽ*), which certainly is so nearly like *ẽ* (= *in*), that it is no wonder that the two were confused in sound.

From this point of view the statements of the different grammarians can all be explained in a rational manner. All agree, of course, that *ain* and *ein* were pronounced alike, and another large number demand diphthongal pronunciation of *ein*. The list is a long one, and beginning with Sylvius (1531) it extends to Dumarsais in 1751 ; but all seem to find a rational interpretation on the supposition that *ein* was pronounced *ẽẽ*. Sylvius says *sain* and *cinc*, *sainet* and *cinct* are pronounced alike, and yet he insists 'pronuntiamus *ei* monosyllabum, voce scilicet ipsa ex utraque vocali in unum concreta, ut *ingenium*, *engein*, non *engen* nec *engin*. The others of this list, all, of course, taken from Thurot, l. c., are Meigret (1542), Péletier (1549), Beza (1554), Ramus (1562), La Taille (1573), Baïf (1574), Delamothe (1592), Lanoue (1596), Du Val (1604), Bernhard (1607), Mermet (1608), Du Gardin (1620), Maupas (1625), Garnier (1625), Chifflet (1659), D'Allais (1681), Boyer (1703), Billecoq (1711), Dumarsais (1751), and Domergue (1805).

Some of these modify or specify their meaning in rather important ways. Beza (1554) and Ramus (1562) say both vowels are sounded as in the Greek *ei*, and Ramus in his Grammar (1572) describes the sound as *è + i*. Meigret, Péletier and Baïf write *é + i*, while Lanoue, Maupas, Garnier, Du Gardin and Chifflet say both vowels are heard, but the *i* is the more prominent. Lanoue is very emphatic on this point. He says . . . 'la prononciation de ceste terminaison n'est quasi qu'un *i* tout simple, à quoy respond mieux la diphthongue *ei*, dont le son termine sur l'*i*. . . .' I call especial attention to the following statement . . . 'ils s'appari-ent fort bien' à ceux en *in* 'seulement quand on les y rimera, faudra il prendre garde de conformer la prononciation de ceux cy à la leur, n'y exprimant point le son de la diphthongue,' a remark which shows plainly that *ein* and *in* were not exactly identical in sound, as Marchot supposes, l. c. p. 52. A similar statement is made by Du Gardin (1620): '*i* deuant *n* sonne quasi ainsi que *ai* ou *ei*. . . . Mais lors, afin de s'accomoder à la ryme, on oit en *ai* ou *ei* plus l'*i* que l'*a* ou l'*e*;' ordinarily he seems to have been conscious of the pronunciation of both *e* and *i*. From these last mentioned descriptions, beginning with Lanoue in 1596, one is almost tempted to believe that a shifting of the accent from *ēē* > *ēē* took place during the last decades of the XVI century. If this is true, Beza's seeming inconsistency becomes reasonable. In 1554 he describes the sound as a diphthong, like Greek *ei*; in 1584 he says, as we have seen, of *ein* for instance, that the *e* is pronounced 'adeo obscure et correpte, ut vix ejus sonus sentiatur.' This much is certain, that after the year 1600 there are but few grammarians who demand diphthongal pronunciation of *ein*, and as to the descriptions of Billecoq (1711), Dumarsais (1751), and Domergue (1805), not much importance could be attached to them. Even granting that an older usage may have either naturally lived on or been artificially fostered by certain grammarians, in the last named cases quite local causes must have been at work. Dumarsais was born



in Marseilles, and lived there to his 25th year, and Domergue also was a Provençal and spent the greater portion of his life in the South.

Another long list of grammarians on the other hand say very clearly that *ein* was pronounced like *in*, and this definition must of course be explained in the light of those just examined. The following are the authors: Bovelles (1533), R. Estienne (1549), Saint-Liens (1580), Tabourot (1587), De la Faye (1613), Van der Aa (1622), Anonymus (1624), Martin (1632), Anonymus (1654), Duez (1662), Raillet (1664), Mauconduit (1669), De Fenne (1671). The list is long, but it appears at once that the majority belong in the last decades of the XVI and in the XVII century. This unexpected occurrence, taken together with the fact, noted a moment ago, that the grammarians demanding a larger stress upon the *i* (*ē*) than upon the *e* belong to the same period, leads me to accept the following explanation. The older diphthong *ēē* had lost its first element and was pronounced *ē*, identical with the pronunciation of *in*. Some of these descriptions, however, are so positive in demanding *in*, that one is much tempted to believe that *ī* was the pronunciation. R. Estienne advocates this pronunciation for etymological reasons; '*peindre* vient de *pingre* par mutation de *g* en *d*, par quoi semble qu'on deburoit escrire *pindre*, et a ce retire assez nostre pronontiation.' Taking into consideration the fact that in the pronunciation of Latin and in that of the strictly learned words of the time, the syllable *in* was not infrequently pronounced *ī* (cf. the statements of Bovelles, Thurot, II, 422, note 4; Rambaud, Cossard, II, 502), this point of view is not all unreasonable. Fashion also may have had its share of influence. So Van der Aa says, '*ai* ou *ay* devant *n* ou *m* se prononce élégamment et à la manière de la cour comme *i*.' Deimier (1610), though he insists upon a difference in sound between *ein* and *in*, teaches that by certain classes *in* was pronounced *ī*; '*les damoiselles de ceste grande ville et tous autres gens de bon lieu qui parlent bon français profèrent ces termes vin, diuin, chemin, destin, etc., comme ils*

sont escrits ordinairement,' and D'Aisy, as late as 1674, refers to those who with affectation pronounce '*in* pour *ên*, *vain* et *fain* comme *vin* et *fin*, ce qui est un vice de leur province.'

While then in certain classes of society *êê* may have become *î*, and even remained with this quality quite late in the XVII century, there is on the other hand a great deal of evidence showing that the common pronunciation, and that which the majority of the grammarians wished to teach, was not *î*. Two of the last list of grammarians given, Duez and Raillet, compare the sound with that of the German *ing*, but Duez especially is interesting, for he says, '*wie auff Teutsch eng oder ing als ceindre*,' indicating beyond a doubt that the nasal was opener than *î*. Other grammarians demand that *ein* should be pronounced opener than *in*, and this before the end of the XVI century. H. Estienne (1582) contradicts the statement of his father, quoted above; '*minime dubium tibi relinquatur, quin ore magis aperto proferre debeas vain . . . quam vin . . . pain quam pin . . .*,' though he concedes that '*litera i contenta esse possent . . . pindre. . .*' The same demand is made by Oudin (1633) and Dubois (1682). Others again merely state the fact that a difference exists between *ein* and *in*, without defining the nature of this difference. The first of these is Sylvius (1531); '*pronuntiamus ei monosyllabum, voce scilicet ipsa ex utraque vocali in unum concreta, ut ingenium, engein non engen, nec engin.*' Deimier (1610) denounces such rhymes as *humain* : *chemin*, *vain* : *divin*, and says it is '*le procéder des poëtes licencieux de rimer de la sorte, accomodans leur foiblesse sur la varieté du commun parler des Champannois, qui prononcent vain au lieu de vin, et destain au lieu de dire destin, comme aussi quelques vns du vulgaire de Paris en vsent ainsi.*' Aubert (1613) also criticizes the rhyme *fin* : *dessin*. Chifflet (1659), while conceding that in *ain* and *ein* the *i* is heard more than the *e*, still says, '*il ne faut pas pourtant . . . prononcer fin, min, crinte, crindre.*'

A difference between *ein* and *in* is thus made certain for the first half of the XVII century, and this difference con-

sisted in a tendency to approach the popular pronunciation of *ein*, which was itself very similar to the modern sound. This popular pronunciation *e* was firmly established towards the last quarter of the XVI century. From earlier evidence, I think, the presumption has been made plausible that at that period the accent of the nasal diphthong was shifted from *ēē* to *ēē̃*. The common pronunciation went still further, and changed the sound to *ē̃*. Rambaud in 1578 writes *prochain*, *pain*, *écrivain*, *main*, *grains*, with an 'é fermé, marqué du signe de nasalité.' Deimier, as has been shown, condemns the pronunciation *vain* for *vin*, and *destain* for *destin*, as 'le commun parler des Champannois,' which is corroborated for an earlier period by Beza, l. c. p. 66: 'Campanorum vero istud est proprium, quod in his vocalibus pronuntiant diphthongum *ai*, id est *e* quod apertum vocavimus, ut *pen*, *men*, pro quo Itali per *a*, *pan*, *man*.' Very similar was also the common pronunciation at Paris. Tabourot (1587) says, 'autres y a, qui prononcent à la parisienne in comme *ain*. Exemple *i'ay beu de bon vain à la pomme de pain* pour dire *i'ay beu de bon vin à la pomme de pin*.' Van der Aa (1622) gives the following rule: '*ai* ou *ay* devant *n* ou *m* se prononce . . . populairement comme *ei*. Dis élégamment *min*, autrement *mein*.'

Others go still further and demand *en* as the correct pronunciation. Spalt (1626) says, '*a* dans *ain* rapproche de *e*, comme dans *pain*, *train*, *soudain*, *plaindre*, mais la syllabe est très brève;' 'Germanus hanc diphthongum suae vernaculae frequentissimam purè pronunciat, si sui idiomatis ductum rectè sequatur, ut *feindre*, *esteindre* . . . parum tantum clausioribus labiis.' About the same time Noël Parfoit says *ai* in *pain*, *main*, *grain* is pronounced 'comme l'*e* simple,' and Cossard (1633), '*a* devant *i* en vne mesme syllabe sonne quasi comme *e*, comme *airain*, *ainsi*, *sain*. . . .' At the same time the difference between the popular pronunciation and the more elegant and refined pronunciation as *ē̃* (or *ē̃̃*), must have existed till nearly the end of the century. As late as 1671 Richelet in his *Versification* speaks of the controversy which exists

<i>e + i.</i>	<i>e + i.</i>	<i>in.</i>	<i>ein opener than in.</i>	<i>ē.</i>	
Palsgrave 1530. Sylvius 1531.  Meigret 1542. Péletier 1549. Beza 1554. Ramus 1562. La Taille 1573. Baif 1574.		Bovelles 1533.  R. Estienne 1549.   Saint-Liens 1580.		Rambaud 1578. ē.	
Delamothe 1592. Lanoue 1596.  Du Val 1604. Bernhard 1607. Mermet 1608.  Du Gardin 1620.  Garnier 1625. Maupas 1625.  Chifflet 1659.	Beza 1584.  Lanoue 1596.   Du Gardin 1620.  Garnier 1625. Maupas 1625.  Chifflet 1659.	Tabourot 1587.  Du Val 1604.  De la Faye 1613.  Van der Aa 1622. Anon. 1624. (Garnier 1625.)  Martin 1632.  Anon. 1654. (Chifflet <i>condemns in.</i> ) Duez 1662. Raillet 1664. Mauconduit 1669. De Fenne 1671.	H. Estienne 1582.       Oudin 1633.	Spalt 1626. Noël Parfait. Cossard 1633.	De       Va
D'Allais 1681.   Boyer 1703. Billecoq 1711.  Dumarsais 1751.  Domergue 1805.		Mourgues 1685. Hindret 1687. Adry 1689. Dangeau 1694.	Du Bois 1682.	D'Aisy 1674.   Dangeau 1694. De la Touche 1696.  Regnier Desmarais 1705.  Buffier 1709.	D'

	<i>ĩ</i> elegant pron	<i>ē</i> vulgar pron.	<i>ein</i> diff. from <i>in</i> .	<i>ein</i> : <i>in</i> good rhyme.	<i>ein</i> : <i>in</i> bad rhyme.
			Sylvius 1531.		
	Deimier 1610 ( <i>for Lat.</i> in).  Van der Aa 1622.	Beza 1584. Tabourot 1587.  Deimier 1610 ( <i>for Lat.</i> in).  Van der Aa 1622.	Deimier 1610. Aubert 1613.	Lanoue 1596 ( <i>but then a change in pron. is necessary</i> ).  Du Gardin 1620 ( <i>with change in pron.</i> ).  Martin 1632.	Deimier 1610. Aubert 1613.
705.	D'Aisy 1674.	D'Aisy 1674 ( <i>for Lat.</i> in).	D'Aisy 1674.	De la Croix 1675 ( <i>says some approve ein: in, others not</i> ).  Mourgues 1685.	

oad rhyme.	
10. 3.	Lubin 1609. } } Germ. } <i>ein.</i> Spalt 1626. }
	Duez 1662. } Germ. Raillet 1664. } <i>eng, ing.</i>

with regard to the rhyming of *ain* and *in*, some saying that such rhymes are admissible, others condemning them.

But as we reach the last decades of the XVII century, the evidence becomes more harmonious again ; and it is correct to conclude that all three combinations had reached the identical sound  $\tilde{e}$ . D'Aisy (1674), while describing *ain* and *ein* as  $\tilde{e}n$ , 'avec un son confus,' still criticizes the bad pronunciation  $\tilde{e}n$  for *in*, 'quand on prononse *vin* comme *vain* et *fin* comme *faim*. Il y en a qui font une faute toute contraire, prononçant mesmes avec affectation *in* pour  $\tilde{e}n$ , *vain* et *faim* comme *vin* et *fin*, ce qui est un vice de leur province.' However, only one year later, in 1675, De la Croix says, 'la rime est bonne, quand c'est le même son, bien que l'écriture soit différente comme dans ces rimes *ain*, *aim*, *ein*, *in*, *im*. This is also the teaching of Mourgues (1685), Hindret (1687), and Adry (1689), and though it might be objected here that all three demand a pronunciation  $\tilde{i}$  in all these syllables, this cannot be said of Dangeau (1694), who says the sound '*en* tel qu'il est dans la dernière syllabe de *soutien* est quelquefois exprimé par *ain* comme dans *craindre*, quelquefois par *ein*, comme dans *feindre*, quelquefois même par *in*, comme dans *divin*.' This is almost unanimously the testimony of the grammarians during the XVIII century.

We may now briefly resume the results of this study. During the greater part of the XVI century, *in* is pronounced  $\tilde{i}$  or  $\tilde{e}$ , while *ain* and *ein* sound like  $\tilde{e}\tilde{e}$ . Towards the end of the century  $\tilde{e}\tilde{e}$  becomes  $\tilde{e}\tilde{e}$ , *in* remains  $\tilde{e}$ , and the two sounds are not infrequently confused. A certain elegance in pronunciation even changed both to  $\tilde{i}$ . At the same time, the popular pronunciation tended to open the nasal ( $\tilde{e} > \tilde{e} > \tilde{e}$ ); this pronunciation is taught by Rambaud in 1578, and is fully established by the end of the XVII century (Dangeau, 1694).<sup>1</sup>

JOHN E. MATZKE.

<sup>1</sup> In the accompanying table I have attempted to group and classify the descriptions and definitions of the different grammarians cited by Thurot, and I trust that this grouping has been done in a manner to warrant the accuracy of the conclusions which I have drawn from them.